THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

The Quarterly Gazette of the Anglican Society.

SPRING, 1943. **[WARTIME EDITION. 6d.]** **Vol. 15. No. 53**

President: The Revd. H. ADEANE BYARD, The Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.
General Secretary & Hon. Treasurer: The Revd. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.
Editor: The Revd. A. W. BLANCHETT, Chadlington, Oxford.
Diocesan Organizing Secretaries: List obtainable from the Hon. Secretary.
America: The Revd. F. F. E. BLAKE, 1625 Locust Street, Philadelphia.

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY ARE: 1.—To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer. 2.—To uphold and appreciate the English use, both in rite and ceremonial.

All who are in sympathy with the Objects of the Society are invited to communicate with the General Secretary. Annual subscription for members, 3/6, which includes subscription to the *English Catholic* (2/- per annum, post free).

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

I. THE SACRIFICE OF THE OLD COVENANT.

Wherever man has been found, we find in him the instinct to worship a supreme being—a deity of some kind. From the extinct races of Central America, the Celts in Britain, to the Pygmies of Central Africa, or the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands; this instinct to worship the Deity or God expressed itself in the form of sacrifice – in the offering of some material gift of fruit, flowers, vegetables, and most often the offering of an animal or even a human being.

The religion of the Hebrews was no exception to this sacrificial instinct. The writings usually known to us as the Old Testament have preserved a record of the growth and development of the Jewish system of sacrifice. It runs its course through a tangle of ideas and habits; and in the background we get glimpses of the rival sacrificial systems of the surrounding Semitic peoples. Many of the ideas are crude and superstitious. But these are gradually superseded and Judaism advances beyond all other religions of its day in its spiritual significance and ethical value.

Of peculiar interest to the Christian is the sacrificial system of Judaism that was in use in the time of our Lord.

The term "sacrifice" in modern parlance looks back to the work of Christ. Even when we encounter the expression in non-religious affairs of to-day, its use is still governed by ideas connected with Calvary. Thus a man is said to "sacrifice" his life for his country; or a shopkeeper will announce that his stock is for sale at a "great sacrifice." In these instances there is implied or suggested an immediate loss in order that some end may be achieved. The man sacrifices or gives up his life for the honour and freedom of his country. The shopkeeper sacrifices his stock in order that the public may benefit. The important point to keep in mind is, that the modern idea of sacrifice is governed by the atoning work of Christ upon the Cross. The Death of Jesus is regarded as the classical example of sacrifice—a giving up, a self sacrifice—for the benefit of mankind.

As we shall see, however, if the modern idea of sacrifice is dominated and governed by the thought of Christ Crucified, it is also true to say that, the work of our Lord has completely altered and transformed the original and older ideas of sacrifice which were in existence before, and during, Christ's life upon earth. So completely has a transformation taken place in the ideas of sacrifice that we moderns are most of us almost ignorant or out of touch with the ideas which underlay pre-Christian sacrifice. We shall do well to remember that the writers of the New Testament had been brought up on the older ideas of sacrifice, and being familiar with the sacrificial system they interpreted the Life, Death and Resurrection of our Lord in terms of a system familiar to the

world of their day. Hence the language and thoughts they used were sacrificial.

We shall never understand what sacrifice meant in our Lord's day unless we understand something of the system and the underlying ideas. We shall see that our modern idea of sacrifice is really a concentration on a part, but only a part, of the sacrificial ideas of the ancient world. Our loss of the ancient and Biblical meaning of sacrifice is no small matter, but is really one of the causes of the modern estrangement from the Christian Faith. The task is rendered even more difficult by the modern fashion of almost ignoring the Old Testament part of the Bible as being démodé and unnecessary. Men have forgotten what sacrifice is, as they have also forgotten the meaning of worship. As with worship, so with sacrifice, for one is bound up with the other. We must return to the Bible—the whole Bible—if we would understand the true meaning of the New Covenant of God and His People as revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ. The New Covenant of God sealed in the Blood of his Christ is the completion and fulfilment of the Old Covenant. ("Covenant" is the best term to use and means an agreement sealed and brought into force by sacrifice between God and his People.)

In the time of our Lord sacrifice in Judaism was limited to the Temple at Jerusalem. All other sanctuaries and shrines had been suppressed or done away. It may help if we first set out the ideas connected with Jewish sacrifices, and then deal with the two great seasons of sacrifice, viz. the Passover and the Day of Atonement.

(1) The worshipper or offerer draws near with his gift or animal victim. The creature offered to God is an expression of his homage and worship and it re-affirms the Covenant between God and his chosen people.

(2) The offerer lays his hands on the animal victim, the idea being that the victim is dedicated or consecrated to God.

(3) The victim is killed by the *offerer*—a sinner.

(The popular idea is that the priest kills the victim, but the killing is done by the offerer).

The offerer killing the victim signifies that the sinner kills himself. For he has identified himself with the victim by the laying on of hands.

(4) The Blood is collected and taken by the priest or priests and sprinkled against the altar or poured out before the altar. The manipulation of the blood by the priest is a most important feature in all ancient sacrifices. Blood meant the soul or life of the victim. Thus we read "The life of the Flesh is in the blood and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." (Leviticus xvii, 11).

(5) The flesh of the victim (or part of the flesh) is placed upon the altar and burnt with fire. The offering is not destroyed but etherealized or transformed so that it can ascend in smoke to God in heaven.

(6) A portion of the victim was eaten (except in the case of the whole burnt offering). If we analyse this idea, it seems to suggest Communion—Fellowship between God and his people. Now that atonement has been made by the offering of the life-blood of the victim, the offerer can approach God. God and man are at one in the sacred meal of fellowship; and man finds fellowship with man.

Underlying the whole conception of sacrifice is the thought of the Covenant and the renewal of the Covenant.

As we now consider the feast of the Passover we must remember that Jesus and his disciples as orthodox Jews were familiar with it. Further, let us remember that the Passover most probably coincided with the day of our Lord's Crucifixion.

The Passover was the annual commemoration which the Jews held in connection with the release from slavery in Egypt; and how the Lord God had by great wonders delivered them from the cruel yoke of Pharaoh. It was the Red Letter day in Jewish history. So the Passover was kept as an act of homage and thanksgiving. (Exodus xii, 26).

The lambs which were eaten at the Passover were to be without spot or blemish. They were first taken by the head man of each household to the Temple. There they were slain. Then the victims were taken home, roasted and eaten, thus the adult members of the family partook of a meal of communion—fellowship.

The other great day in the Jewish year—the Day of Atonement—was the great occasion of national penitence and sacrifice for sin. On this occasion, contrary to the usual custom, the victims were slain by the High Priest, for he himself was, on this occasion of national penitence, considered to be one of the nation and therefore a

sinner. The blood was collected and the High Priest alone passed through the great veil or curtain into the innermost sanctuary of the Temple. This was the most holy place and the Lord God was believed to dwell here. It was known as, the "Holy of Holies." There the High Priest sprinkled and poured out before the Mercy Seat of Jehovah the lifeblood of the victims for the sins of the Church-Nation of Israel. Once a year only this passing into the Holy of Holies occurred. Dr. Bright's well-known hymn "Once, only once" (E.H. 327, A. & M. 315) shows us how Christ completes the work of the Day of Atonement.

The Passover and the Day of Atonement were the great seasons of sacrifice but there were, too, the daily sacrifices in the Temple. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of our Lord as the true and great High Priest who bears the blood of the victim—his own blood—into the true Holy of Holies, heaven itself. (Heb. ix, 11—18). The English Liturgy most significantly appoints this portion of Scripture as the Epistle for Passion Sunday when the Church bids us think especially of atonement and redemption from sin.

(*To be continued*).

ENGLISH CATHOLICISM, CAROLINE OR MEDIAEVAL?

Really of course it is neither, since the part is not the whole. English Catholicism in fact, like Roman Catholicism, is strictly speaking a contradiction of terms. One prefers to be just "a Catholic" rather than an "Anglo-" or other hyphenated variety. But *tot homines, tot sententiae*: men will continue to be herded into groups and pens and will call each other sheep or goats. Nevertheless the title of this article may serve. Four books have recently been published* which give a good impression of the century and a quarter which is known as the Reformation Period, and help one to discern the various influences at work to mould the situation which existed when the Prayer Book emerged into its present form in 1662.

Mr. Garrett Mattingley's life of Catherine of Aragon is most useful for the insight which it gives us into the complex personality of Henry VIII. Catherine was a fine character and her chief contribution to religion in England was that she kept her husband more or less on the rails as long as she did. Henry was always under somebody's thumb, whether it was wife or Chancellor, until he turned on them and cut off their heads, and it is mainly thanks to Catherine's influence that for all his flirtations with Lutheranism and his persecution of those who opposed the royal supremacy he remained a Catholic at heart to the end of his days. Like many men of strong sexual passions he was naturally religious and even the besotted disease-ridden tyrant of later years retained glimmerings of the faith of his youth. True, like many other despots he loved to play the part of amateur theologian and to invoke the Almighty as his partner and Grand Ally, but for all his faults he was in actual fact a defender of the Faith. Field Marshal Smuts said recently of the Battle of Britain "Providence saved us then. Let us admit it, the devil helped him. That is always the function of evil in this world." Even the wrath of Henry VIII could turn to God's praise.

Mr. Belloc's Commentary is most informative, though one cannot agree with all his conclusions. In spite of the obviously tendentious nature of some of his assertions he is on sure ground when he describes the so-called Reformation in England as imposed from without for political rather than religious reasons. There may have been abuses in some of the Monasteries, but it was their dissolution from motives of pure greed that set the ball rolling which changed the religious, and at the same time the social and economic face of this country for generations to come. This act of gangsterism is usually attributed to the avariciousness of the King, spurred on of course by Thomas Cromwell for his own selfish ends, but while Henry was as acquisitive of wealth as he was of wives, and was often hard up, especially for money to finance the French war during the later years of his reign, the primary cause of his attack on the monasteries was the need for buttressing the power of the throne by conciliating the new aristocracy which had grown up to take the place of the victims of the Wars of the Roses, and it was they who received most of the loot. Henry VIII was never allowed to forget that he was the great-grandson of a

* (1) "Catherine of Aragon," by Garrett Mattingley; (2) "Spanish Tudor," by H.P.H. Prescott; (3) "Elizabethan Commentary," by Hilaire Belloc; (4) "The High Church Tradition," by G. W. O. Adleshaw.

Welsh farm-bailiff, and right through the Tudor period the throne was insecure. It is estimated that no less than from one third to one fifth of all the rentals of England changed hands between 1536 and 1540. This process continued during the remaining years of Henry's reign and a further transformation of the landed system through the gradual loot of religion was carried out during the reign of Edward VI. The gang of harpies led by, the Seymour brothers, which swooped down on England while the nominal king was still a little boy got rid of all manner of Church endowments to fill their own pockets. They sliced great fragments off the Episcopal revenues and got into their hands large amounts of tithe and other Church property. Although checked under Mary this continued throughout the reign of Elizabeth until the whole face of England was transformed. It would be idle to suppose that because her treasure is in heaven the work of the Church is not hindered, temporarily at any rate, by the loss of many of the earthly weapons which are her agencies for spreading the Faith. During the Renaissance period more rapid changes took place in the general life of Europe than at almost any stage in history, and times of change have generally proved difficult for religion. When the "have nots" have become the "haves" they are wont to regard religion as an inconvenient threat to the security of their gains, and seek to neutralise its influence. There is a lesson here for our own times and Sir Stafford Cripps's recent speech at the Albert Hall sounded a note of warning to which we should give heed.

Mr. Belloc is inclined to underestimate the genuine desire for a spiritual reformation which undoubtedly existed among the most thoughtful Englishmen, and he may have overstated the importance of the dissolution of the Monasteries. It would be interesting too to speculate as to whether a separation from the Papacy would have taken place without Henry VIII.

Hitherto England had been closely linked to the Continent not only by ecclesiastical but by political and economic ties such as dependence on her wool trade with the Low Countries. With the upsurging of the spirit of nationalism everywhere she became more truly an island than ever before and she had always reacted uneasily to the Papal claims. One gathers from Mr. Prescott's study of Mary Tudor that at the outset of her reign, if she had been given a decent chance, she would have been quite willing to preserve religion in England as Henry VIII left it. In spite of his cruel treatment of her mother and herself she seems to have retained a good deal of affection for her father. Mr. Prescott shows her to have been a good and pious woman who has been much misjudged. The Seymours and their like championed the candidature for the throne of Lady Jane Grey from fear of the loss of their ill-gotten gains, but the mass of Englishmen gave a warm welcome to Mary as her mother's daughter. Unfortunately her unhappy and childless marriage warped a nature already embittered, and the Spanish inheritance which made her able only to see black or white made her fiercely intolerant. It is not to be wondered at that a grandchild of Ferdinand of Aragon, a frail woman among a horde of self-seekers, should have been tortuous in her policy. How far she was personally responsible for the burnings will probably never be known, but the fires of Smithfield sealed the doom of the Papacy in England. Apart from this the reign of Mary was no more than an interlude.

It is hardly to be expected that Mr. Belloc would take a rosy view of Queen Elizabeth. He is not quite fair in treating her as the puppet of William Cecil and his company. Although not a religious woman she had a passionate love of England and was determined to keep the ship of the Church on an even keel. He is probably more right in assuming that the intruders on the Abbey Lands, while maintaining the facade of the official C. of E., aimed at securing their possessions by diverting the religious instincts of the nation into the barren wilderness of Puritanism. The doctrines of Calvin made little appeal to a large part of the English people or their rulers,—it is to the credit of Elizabeth that she barred John Knox from her kingdom—but they were a convenient safety valve and opiate. "To our successors," Mr. Belloc says, "this strange episode of the Puritan madness may become dull and meaningless." Yet it has profoundly affected the English mind and even more so the development of the United States.

In reviewing Mr. Belloc's latest book *Punch* says that his Catholicism is institutional rather than mystical, which is doubtless true, but it is curious that in dealing with Elizabeth's reign he rather soft-pedals the Papal question, and lays more emphasis on the

Mass as the central feature of the old order. He reckons that at the end of that period about half the population of England still hankered after the old Latin Mass, which is probably as much an exaggeration as his estimate that on the death of James II one-eighth of the families of England were Romanist. Yet almost in the same breath he pays a striking tribute to our "incomparable liturgy":—"The Church of England, as we know it, was created by its Liturgy, one of the finest things in the literature of Europe, and also a thing unique . . . it is the prose of the English Liturgy more than any other spiritual force in those violent days, which achieved the separation of the older England, inheriting from even the first centuries of Christendom, and the new England of the last 3½ centuries." And he adds "it is unlikely that it will ever be replaced".

On this England, sicklied o'er by the pale cast of Puritan thought, there shone like a beacon light the revival of devotion by the Caroline divines, Andrewes and Laud and their successors. Mr. Addleshaw dates "the High Church tradition" from Andrewes to the Oxford Movement, and names Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen, who died in 1854 in his 99th year, as "the last of the High Churchmen." Their great aim was (*a*) to restore the Catholic Faith to the Church of England free from all Papal and Sectarian innovations, (*b*) to make the Liturgy the centre of the life of the Church, (*c*) to bring back into its true relationship to life worship which had become individualised and divorced from the ordinary life of the world. In Thorndike's words "The Eucharist is the crown of public service and the most solemn and chief work of Christian assemblies." (*d*) to enable the congregation to take a more active and intelligent part in the services. To this end they developed what was in many respects a new and distinct ceremonial to fit the vernacular liturgy. The Tractarians were at first disposed to revive this, as the normal standard of the Church of England, and in 1838 Dr. Bloxam, who was Curate at Littlemore with Newman, gave a cover for the altar of crimson velvet and a frontal falling in folds at the corners worked by Miss Anne Mozley. Mr. Addleshaw mentions this idea with approval, but one cannot but be glad that it was not generally adopted. The 17th century divines did a great work in reviving the spirit of religion and raising the standard of worship, if only on a limited scale, to that of the monastic era, but their age was one of confusion, change and experiment, and the fashions which they adopted were those of their own short period. When the Church emerged at the Restoration from the dark night of Puritan domination it turned for the outward expression of its worship to the forms which had been hallowed by centuries of devotion in the ages of faith, and were the creation of men whose taste had not been vitiated by commercialism and whose art was almost perfect in colour and line. As the days of S. Athanasius when "the whole world groaned and found itself Arian" were followed by the age of the General Councils in which the Catholic creeds were hammered out, so in 1662 the Church of England awoke with a sigh of relief, as it were from a bad dream, and harked back over the intervening century to the 2nd year of King Edward VI. But why the second year? Mr. Royle Shore in his valuable paper which was read to the Annual Meeting of the Anglican Society in 1941, on "Recent discoveries and the Church Courts," and printed in the *E.C.* vol. 13, no. 47, pointed out that this was before the 1st Prayer Book of King Edward VI, which was not signed until after the beginning of his third year. The standard therefore was that which was in use at the death of Henry VIII. Why not then the first year which would be immediately after his death? Perhaps because the very suggestion of Henry's name would leave a bad taste in the mouth, while that of the innocent boy king, the misnamed benefactor of many educational foundations, would be harmless enough! Thus it is writ large across the front page of our Prayer Book:—"Such ornaments of the Church and the Ministers thereof . . . shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of King Edward VI . . . And the Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past."

J. E. Bowles.

THAXTED,

(By kind permission of "The Guardian")

It would be a duty overlooked if the laying of Conrad Noel's frail bones almost beneath the altar of his beloved Thaxted church were allowed to pass without some recalling of the notable loveliness of the music with which his ministry there will always be associated. If one tried to think of characteristic keynotes, they would be "economy" and "richness"; yet that would not give a sufficient clue. It would be impossible to give the slightest account of the music without frequent reference to its liturgical bearings. There was the vital connexion between the liturgy and the music which was even closer than walking together as friends; they were integral parts of a whole. Nobody realized more vividly than Conrad Noel that, if the music in his church were in any true sense to be called "church music", it could be so only if it were "functional", if it faithfully reflected the contours of the liturgy it clothed, and if in character it breathed that note of solemn grandeur with which the liturgy itself speaks. He feared neither silence nor the spoken-voice.

On the negative side, he was perfectly clear what church music should not be. If he were considering Evensong, for instance, a conception he would immediately reject would be that of applying a thickly even layer of four-part harmony to every item of the service where music was applicable: that would have flattened the shape and blunted the points.

He was too good an artist to lack a design, or to ignore the cumulative experience of the centuries. While holding clearly in view the essentially social character of worship, and recognizing that the prime motive of Evensong lay in reciting the psalms and reading the Bible, he was quick to see that, within that scheme, the "drawing" of Evensong in the Prayer-book rose to a climax in *Magnificat*, and he knew, of course, that this echoed the shape of the older Vespers that underlay it. In this light, he marshalled his limited musical resources.

My memory of Evensong in Thaxted some 18 years ago (while the musical influence of Gustav Holst was still happily potent) is vivid to-day. Imagine the quiet glow of a summer's Sunday evening, the spacious white nave perhaps half filled with silent worshippers, sun streaming through the clear glass of the west windows and flooding those wing-like wide aisles with sunshine; the gravity of the Wren-like pulpit and sounding-board half way down the nave, the glint of some pleasant picture or figure or hanging nearby, and the comparative gloom of the long, wide chancel beyond, unhampered by stalls and dominated by the quiet and almost homely dignity of the long high altar, its pervading colour of gentle green with a brush of soft gold and two star-like dots of candle light, and an amethyst twinkle from the silver lamp hanging before it.

In such a setting, expectant silence seemed natural, and without any formal entrance of choir (the singers merely grouped themselves informally at the west end) or organ prelude, Conrad Noel, in flowing surplice and black, cape-like hood, emerged quietly from an aisle and sat in a cottage chair almost at the foot of the pulpit. No note of music was heard till "O Lord, open thou our lips", to which choir and congregation responded simply and in unison, without the intervention of organ.

For meditating on the psalms we all sat saying the verses alternately with the priest in our midst, and the gravity of the speaking voice seemed emphasized by contrast with the thin melodic line of the responses just before: it was strangely satisfying and suitable.

A member of the congregation (I think it was the parish clerk) rose from his chair, went to the lectern, and read the lesson with direct simplicity; this was followed by the evening office hymn—I forget whether we sang it to its ancient melody, or to the less ancient French melody which is also set for it in the *English Hymnal*. But, whichever the tune, there was some division of labour, the "singers" no doubt alternating with the congregation, and the organ supporting.

While this was in course Conrad Noel had moved, quite unnoticed, into the south aisle and towards the transept vestry, behind the gaily-coloured curtains of which one may well imagine such converse as:

"Well, Ernie, are you ready?"

"Yes, Padre", and Ernie, in his cassock and long winged rochet would have the pleasant-shaped censer quietly swinging with its glowing charcoal.

"Let's see, what cope shall we have?

Oh, I think that old green and pink one would be nice to-night. Thank you. Ah, they're beginning the last verse of the office hymn: shall we go in?"

And the little company of two would go across the old red paving of the chancel, past those two copper bowls of marigolds or roses, up to the sea-green carpet, and so to the altar itself.

Back in the congregation, the singers had begun the solemn chant of *Magnificat*, for the first two verses of which the ascetic bitter-sweet chant seemed entirely right. Then, quite suddenly, those few voices burst forth into the rich flowering which old William Byrd had devised for five parts as his vocal decoration of the already ancient *Tonus Peregrinus*. The effect seemed almost overwhelming, and its glory at once fitted the triumph-song of the Blessed Virgin, and marked unmistakably the apex of Even-song's architecture. Thence back to the bare unison chant, then another gorgeous blossoming, again the chant, and so on—all of course, without the aid of the organ. The singers trod on firm ground. The mighty were put down from their seats: the hungry were filled with good things.

Meanwhile, in the distant dimness of the chancel the coped figure seemed to potter up at the altar—if the word "potter" could ever be used to describe innate simplicity and dignity of movement—and first a blue column, then a blue haze, of incense slowly rose floating as a mysterious canopy over the place of sacrifice. A few more swings and the little altar party quietly disappeared into the vestry.

The layman read the second lesson, and meanwhile the venerated surpliced figure had resumed his seat, unobserved, in the midst of his flock to continue Evensong. *Nunc dimittis* was sung to a simple tone, in unison and without organ: so it marked a lesser peak of the office, and after Our Father and Creed in the speaking voice, plain unison responses (free and spontaneous they seemed) led to the closing collects. What a gentle voice he had, and what a joy to hear him read!

And that completed Evensong, save that a last hymn was sung as the glow of the sun grew pale—just one verse of Bishop Heber's "God that madest earth and heaven", to the accompaniment of the modest-toned eighteenth-century organ.

The service had been a designed and moulded whole, a model of what Evensong might be in almost any village church if we but had the courage to break away from the one-level monotony of a blindly-applied musical formula—four-part-harmony-with-organ-accompaniment. Here, the shape of the Office had been well studied, the modest resources marshalled and concentrated with the true artistry of precise and graded economy at well-chosen points. Energy had not been vaguely dispersed all over the service. Immense pains and preparation obviously lay behind Byrd's faux-bourdon, and no doubt this served Sunday after Sunday (who could tire of it?), but, because it was not embedded in a background of repeated choral effort, it was produced with the effect of astonishing richness.

Of the Sunday-morning worship, space forbids a description—the utterly simple Litany procession, the slight sinuous harmony at the Introit for the Eucharist, Byrd's lovely three-part *Kyrie*, the invariable Chant for the Creed, ancient and so simple that all might join, and many another feature of beauty that the very light and grace of the church seemed to enhance. Formalism seemed impossible.

Underlying all was, not only the desire to break with mere routine, nor only the love of music as music, nor only the student's knowledge of the past, but true simplicity and the positive delight of combining economy and richness. In the last, of course, is seen a commonplace instrument of the artist. Then Conrad Noel knew, too, that church music can be rightly regarded only as a branch of liturgy, and we remember him as a master in the art of worship.

QUESTATOR.

LITURGICAL NOTES.

In a recent number of the "English Catholic", it was pointed out that Dom Ferdinand Cabrol, in his book "Liturgical Prayer," says that the "Gloria in Excelsis" should never have been inserted between the Kyries and the Collect in the Roman Mass. He cannot speak too highly of this liturgical hymn, but the Kyries and the Collect are closely connected, and it is out of place between them. That this eminent Roman Catholic liturgical scholar should criticize so severely a feature of his own liturgy which the English Church has removed, and which some of her misguided members are

trying to put back, is remarkable enough. But further study of Dom Cabrol's book has disclosed two other passages which may be used in support of our principles.

On p. 206 of the English translation, he says: "The centre of the church, the point to which everything in it converges, is the stone slab, at once table and altar, on which Christ offers the sacrifice of Himself and gives Himself as food to the faithful." It could hardly be better stated. This is precisely why we object to the gradine (the shelf behind the altar, unknown in England until it was introduced by the Victorian architects) and to the standing tabernacle. The centre of the "mensa," the top of the altar, is the point to which everything in the church ought to converge. The gradine draws the eye to a point some inches too high; the standing tabernacle withdraws the attention from the altar altogether. It is the Eucharist itself that is the centre of our worship, the point of meeting between God and man. The reservation of the Blessed Sacrament is only a means of making the Eucharist available to those who cannot be present. But modern Latin devotion (genuine and imitated) has too often tended to make the Eucharist merely the means of providing an object for adoration.

On p. 329, Dom Cabrol is discussing the Epiclesis. He says "It would at first sight seem more logical that this invocation should be *before* the consecration . . . We agree with those learned liturgists who maintain that the Roman Liturgy, with the other liturgies, places the epiclesis after the consecration; that is, taking "Supra Quae" and "Supplices Te" as the epiclesis. In this way the Liturgy keeps to the logical and chronological order of the three Divine Persons in the work of Redemption."

For Dom Cabrol, of course, the theory that the consecration is affected by the words of institution is of faith: nevertheless, he holds that the Roman Liturgy itself contains an Epiclesis, in the same place as in every other ancient liturgy, and even that the "holy angel" who is to carry the gifts to the heavenly altar is the Holy Ghost.

If this be true, there is not a single ancient liturgy, Syrian, Egyptian, Greek, Roman or Gallican, which does not possess an Epiclesis after the words of institution. The present Roman doctrine, that the words of institution are the consecration (held by Dom Cabrol as by all other Roman Catholics) cannot have been held by those who drew up the Canon of the Roman Mass, or they would not have written "panem sanctum vitae aeternae" (holy bread of eternal life) after those words.

It is remarkable that those of our separated brethren, who are reaching out towards a more adequate liturgy than is provided by the Calvinist tradition, accept the Epiclesis as part of it. The liturgy in the latest edition of the Presbyterian "Book of Common Order" contains an epiclesis: and the Rev. Daniel Jenkins, who is a Welsh Congregationalist, in his recent book "The Nature of Catholicity" describes the features which he thinks necessary to the Eucharist, and one of them is the Epiclesis.

The widespread notion that the Epiclesis is peculiarly Eastern is a complete delusion: and the theory held in some quarters that it is not older than the 4th century (when the doctrine of the Holy Spirit first became fully defined), even if true, which is very doubtful, does not come very convincingly from those whose theory of the consecration dates from nearly a thousand years later. The opposition to the Epiclesis, and to the liturgy of 1928 of which it is the culminating point, is not based on reason or history, but solely on prejudice.

C. B. Moss.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE SCARF.

SIR,—Is not much of the controversy about the general use of the Scarf by the clergy really beside the mark from a practical point of view? Is not the important consideration the fact that it has now come to be generally worn, and that thus it fulfils a felt want? It has for a long time just been agreed that something is needed in addition to the surplice, to add dignity to it, and to distinguish a cleric from a choirman? This for a long time resulted in the improper use of the Stole for the purpose, and now we have surely achieved a satisfactory substitute, whatever its past history may have been, and whether or not it was intended to be used with a hood. Can we not all manage to agree on something for once in the way?

E. G. P. WYATT.

White House, Rustington, Littlehampton.

Printed and published by
A. T. BROOME & SON, The Cherwell Press, 18 St. Clement's Street, Oxford.